



08/699,844 08/20/96

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231 18799.79 (TT1)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

ROBERT J. CRAWFORD
CRAWFORD PLLC
333 WASHINGTON AVENUE NORTH, SUITE 5000
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55401

LM01/0427

SAINT SURIN, J

2747

EXAMINER

ART UNIT 14 / PAPER NUMBER

18

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SEE ATTACHMENT!

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory Action	Application No. 08/699,844	Applicant(s) David R. Dettmer
	Examiner Jacques M. Saint-Surin	Group Art Unit 2747

THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on _____ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Mar 29, 1999 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

The proposed amendment(s):

- will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
- will not be entered because:
 - they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
 - they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
 - they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

- Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

- Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

- The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See: attachment.

- The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 1, 2, 4, 7-9, and 20-37 _____

- The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ has has not been approved by the Examiner.

- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

- Other

Art Unit: 2747

1. Applicant's argument states that "the combination is not motivated, the combination does not support the rejection and there is no stated correspondence between many of the limitations of these claims and the asserted combination".

The Examiner, respectfully, disagrees with Applicant's argument because it is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words, the changes or improvements that applicant has made. The test for combining references is what as a whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Scheckler, 168 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1971); In re McLaughlin 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971); In re Young 159 USPQ 725 (CCPA 1968).


FORESTER W. ISEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700


JACQUES M. SAINT-SURIN
PATENT EXAMINER
Jacques M. Saint-Surin
April 22, 1999